

had only males before him when he described *aryxna*) and note how the outer lines (of lighter color) are divided into spots (by the veins having dark coloring). Dyar's description is "It differs from *neumoegeni* in having the fulvous markings considerably reduced, the outer band being broken into spots". It is immediately evident that this description applies equally well to Species No. 1 as to Species No. 2. Hence we are not faced with the problem of the description not fitting the species.

As we see the situation there are two problems to be decided. 1. Does the description of *aryxna* fit the species as restricted by Dyar. 2. Is the restriction of Dyar valid. The answer to both questions in our opinion, is yes.

There is no great problem involved in the literature and the name *aryxna*. The name has only been used in about a dozen different publications. In about half of the publications the author was without information and it is impossible to determine what they were applying the name to. In our paper we have cited the literature in which the name is used in such a manner that you can determine whether the name was applied to Species No. 1 or Species No. 2.

We are unable to give the importance to the fact that Dyar mentioned the two specimens in *Biol. Centr.-Amer.* before he did the ten before him that Bell and Dos Passos do in their recent paper "The Lectotype of *Megathymus Aryxna* Dyar (Lepidoptera, Megathymidae)" American Museum Novitates, No. 1700, Dec. 20, 1954, published shortly after our paper. If this priority is important, then by the same token, Fig. 3 becomes the key—not Fig. 4. To us it appears that Dyar was describing a new species from Arizona—not from Mexico, the specimens before him were what he was describing—he was merely referring to the specimens in the *Biol.* as being the same thing. Even should it be determined that his restriction was not valid we feel it would be an error to designate either of the Mexican specimens as the lectotype.

While the writers feel that the foregoing is the correct situation in regard to the proper application of the name *aryxna* we would not at all be adverse to a waiver of the rules so that the name *aryxna* could be applied to Species No. 1, leaving the name *M. evansi* Freeman available to Species No. 2. This would probably mean, of course, that the lectotype of *aryxna* would then be designated as the Mexican specimen, following Skinner—which we do not feel was the intention of Dyar.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE FOR THE GENUS "SCORPIO" LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS ARACHNIDA), A TYPE SPECIES IN HARMONY WITH ACCUSTOMED USAGE

By OTTO KRAUS

(Forschungs-Institut und Natur-Museum Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.) 567)

(For the proposal submitted see 1955, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 11(6) : 173—175)

(Extract from letter dated 30th July 1955)

Bei dieser Gelegenheit möchte ich Ihnen noch mitteilen, dass ich Ihre Ausführungen über die Gattung *Scorpio* und ihre typische Art mit grossem Interesse gelesen habe. Ihr Antrag ist nachdrücklich zu unterstützen, zumal es sich bei *Scorpio europaeus* Linnaeus, 1758, um eine völlig unsichere Art handelt.